

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please replace the sheet with the previously amended Figure 1 with the attached sheet showing the currently amended Figure 1.

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the following arguments. For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicant's remarks are presented in the order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

REMARKS ON AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The Office Action objected to Figure 1 as last amended because the reference character "107" had been used to designate both Storage device 107 and Docking station 107. The Applicant had intended to correct this in the Applicant's last amendment, but inadvertently submitted the old, uncorrected copy. Figure 1 now designates the Storage device as 107 and the Docking station as 117. No new matter was added in this amendment.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A) BURSTEIN/BURGIN

The last Office Action rejected claims 19-21, 24, 27, 29-31, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Burstein* (US 6,268,716) in view of *Burgin* (US 4,327,298).

Regarding claims 19 and 29:

The Office Action states that *Burstein* does not teach a first and second power source and does not teach as claimed in claim 19:

a secondary voltage regulator to selectively provide additional power to the load from the second power source based at least in part on availability of the second power source, wherein the secondary voltage regulator has a greater power capacity than the primary voltage regulator.

The Office Action continues that *Burgin* does disclose all parts of this limitation. The Applicant respectfully disagrees and believes that *Burgin* does not disclose this limitation.

Burgin discloses *an apparatus with a secondary voltage regulator*. Fig. 1, item 17. However, *Burgin*'s secondary voltage regulator does not have *a greater power capacity than the primary voltage regulator*. *Burgin*'s secondary voltage regulator does

have a higher output voltage than the primary voltage regulator, but a greater voltage output does not inherently mean a greater power capacity. The power capacity of a voltage regulatory would be determined by the output voltage times output current. Voltage regulators are available in many different combinations of voltage and output power. Burgin is silent on the output current and power of its voltage regulators.

Burgin's secondary voltage regulator does not inherently have to be of greater power capacity for Burgin's power supply to perform as disclosed. Burgin's power supply is intended to provide battery backup power automatically to a load "long before its normal input operating voltage, produced from a-c line voltage, will drop as a result of a power failure or a major voltage sag or low voltage transient." Col. 4 lines 9-15. Burgin's secondary voltage regulator only has to have the capacity to regulate the power drawn by the load (Fig. 1, item 25) from the A-C line voltage power source (Fig. 1, item L1-L2). This power passes through both the second voltage regulator and the first voltage regulator (Fig. 1, item 23). The backup power drawn by the load from the battery (Fig. 1, item 34) only passes through the first voltage regulator, not the first. Thus the second voltage regulator only inherently needs to have the same power capacity as the first voltage regulator, not greater.

Furthermore, Burgin's secondary voltage regulator does not *provide additional power to the load*. Burgin's secondary voltage regulator provides alternative power to the load. The battery (34) is a backup power source to the a-c line power source. They are alternatives to each other. Except for a brief transient as the a-c power source goes off or comes on line, Burgin's apparatus does not allow for one power source to provide power in addition to the other.

For at least these reasons, the Applicant believes that the rejection of claim 19 has been overcome.

Claim 29 is a method claim similar to claim 19 and the Office Action gave the same reasons for rejecting claim 29 as for claim 19. Thus the Applicant believes the rejection of claim 29 is overcome for at least the same reasons as the Applicant gave above regarding claim 19.

Regarding claims 18-21, 24, 27, 28-31, 33:

Claims 18-21, 24, 27 are dependent on claim 19. The Applicant believes that the rejections of these claims have been overcome for at least the same reasons as given regarding claim 19.

Claims 28-31, 33 are dependent on claim 29. The Applicant believes that the rejections of these claims have been overcome for at least the same reasons as given regarding claim 29.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A) BURSTEIN/BURGIN/YANAGISAWA

The last Office Action rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Burstein* (US 6,268,716) in view of *Burgin* (US 4,327,298) as applied to claim 24 and in further view of *Yanagisawa* (US 6,078,109).

Regarding claim 25:

The Applicant has argued above that the rejection of claim 24 over *Burstein* in view of *Burgin* has been overcome. The Applicant believes that *Yanagisawa* does not solve the defects of *Burstein* and *Burgin*.

Yanagisawa discloses two loads connected by power conductor, the power conductor intersected by a switch. Fig. 4. A first port for a power supply to connect is connected to the power conductor on one side of the switch and a second port for a power supply to connect is connected to the power conductor on the other side of the switch. When a power supply is attached to the second port the switch closes. Neither port can connect to a power supply that provides power to either load that is being supplied by power from a power supply connected to the other port. Thus neither port can connect to a power supply providing *additional* power to a load. Furthermore, *Yanagisawa* does not disclose voltage regulators at all, much less their relative power capacities.

For at least these reasons, the Applicant believes that the rejection of claim 25 has been overcome.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A) BURSTEIN/BURGIN/YANAGISAWA/TRACY

The last Office Action rejected claims 26, 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Burstein* (US 6,268,716) in view of *Burgin* (US 4,327,298) and *Yanagisawa* (US 6,078,109) as applied to claim 25 and in further view of *Tracy* (US 6,191,943).

Regarding claims 26, 32:

The Applicant has argued above that the rejection of claim 25 over Burstein in view of Burgin in further view of Yanagisawa has been overcome. The Applicant believes that Tracy does not solve the defects the rejection of claim 25.

Tracy teaches active heat dissipation for a docked notebook computer. Tracy does not disclose voltage regulators at all, much least their relative power capacities.

For at least these reasons, the Applicant believes that the rejection of claims 26, 32 have been overcome.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A) BURSTEIN/BURGIN/NORRIS

The last Office Action rejected claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Burstein* (US 6,268,716) in view of *Burgin* (US 4,327,298) as applied to claim 24 and in further view of *Norris* (US 5,630,148).

Regarding claim 28:

The Applicant has argued above that the rejection of claim 24 over Burstein in view of Burgin has been overcome. The Applicant believes that Norris does not solve the defects of Burstein and Burgin.

Norris teaches a computer system with a performance management system. Norris does not disclose voltage regulators at all, much least their relative power capacities.


For at least these reasons, the Applicant believes that the rejection of claim 28 has been overcome.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Phil Hunt at (503) 439-6073. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: 1/30/07


Philip Hunt
Attorney for the Client
Reg. No. 58,044

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 439-8778